



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/608,028

06/30/2000

Kartik Raghavan

MS1-498US

9044

22801

7590

04/01/2008

LEE & HAYES PLLC

421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500

SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

COLIN, CARL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/608,028	Applicant(s) RAGHAVAN ET AL.	
	Examiner CARL COLIN	Art Unit 2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 1/10/2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

Response to Arguments

2. In response to communications filed on 8/10/2007, applicant amends claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 13, 21, 27, 28, 32, and 36. The following claims 1-36 are presented for examination.

2.1 Applicant's arguments, in the appeal brief, filed on 1/10/2008, have been fully considered but they are not fully persuasive. Applicant argues about reference 700 of Cheng not meeting

Art Unit: 2136

the claimed recitation of configuration agent because 700 refers to addressable memory.

Examiner respectfully disagrees as Cheng also discloses software as part of 700. In fact applicant specification fig.4 a configuration agent comprises memory and software. Therefore Examiner does not understand how Cheng does not meet the claimed configuration agent.

Applicant argues pages 30-34 that the configuration agent of Cheng does not disclose obtaining, interrogating, and comparing. Examiner respectfully disagrees as Cheng discloses modules (software as part of configuration agent 700) for instance column 17, lines 35-47, payment module determines form the database data (fees that specified software updates) that specifies authorized resources that meets the recitation of obtaining. Cheng further discloses column 17, lines 55-63) using update ID to fulfill a transaction to cite the least that meets the recitation of obtaining. Cheng discloses (see column 18, lines 18-65), the modification modules identifying software product on the client computer for previous version so as to install new update (see also fig. 13b, emphasis added) that meets the recitation of interrogating. Applicant argues that although Cheng discloses comparison at the service provider computer, Cheng is limited to products installed on the client computer. Examiner respectfully disagrees as column 14, lines 45-64 specifically states "the release information in the table indicates a version later than the version that is installed." Therefore, the later version that is being compared to is not installed.

Applicant argues that Cheng discloses which users are authorized not authorized resources.

Examiner respectfully disagrees as Cheng discloses as each user is associated with specific software updates (see column 15, lines 1-4) Cheng discloses (see column 20, lines 4-14) software updates must be approved for installation, ("verifying integrity of the software update")and user profile database contains personal user information along with software products for that

Art Unit: 2136

particular user. Therefore, the disclosure meets the claim recitation of authorized resources. In addition, the data that specify authorized resources as claimed can be broadly and reasonably interpreted to one of ordinary skill in the art as identifiers as disclosed in Cheng, (i.e. user identifier, update ID, etc.). Applicant argues on pages 37-39 that Examiner's position is inconsistent. Examiner respectfully disagrees because the interview summary of February 23, 2006 does not indicate Examiner agrees that assessment or determination of authorized resources is made to provide the resources to the new computing system. The last paragraph used by applicant referring to page 11, 3 lines from the bottom to page 12, line 9 of the specification to show inconsistency in Examiner's position is not a description with respect to a new computing system, see ("to be discussed more fully below") (see full paragraph on page 12, emphasis added), the full paragraph on page 11 is the only paragraph in the specification referring particularly to a "new" computing system. Therefore, Examiner's position is correct with evidence of record and the amendment after the final raises the issues of new matter. Regarding claim 2, applicant argues that Cheng does not disclose the products preinstalled as authorized resources. Examiner respectfully disagrees as Cheng discloses in column 17 that the products are related to specific user and transaction permission is needed to receive the resources. See also response above with respect to authorized resources. With respect to claim 28, it appears that applicant is interpreting unconfigured as configured for the first time which is not claimed as argued in the appeal brief (see pages 43-49). Therefore, as discussed above, applicant's arguments in the appeal brief are not persuasive. Examiner does not contend to applicant's arguments regarding prior art Cheng as explained above. Upon further consideration, in order to

Art Unit: 2136

expedite the prosecution in view of the claims as amended a new ground of rejection is made.

The rejection of claims 1-36 is set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.1 Claims 28 and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's disclosure fails to recite comparing the assessment to authorized resources and authorized resources in a new unconfigured computing system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,535,976 to **Hoggarth et al.**

As per claim 1, **Hoggarth et al** discloses a method comprising: maintaining, on a server for each of a plurality of computing systems, client profiles and software profile (see column 7, lines 54-57; column 8, lines 16-20 and lines 43-51; and column 9, lines 5-10) the client profiles and software profile contain data that specify which resources are required for the computing system. Although **Hoggarth et al** does not use the term "authorized" as interpreted by the Examiner, since the clients systems have different configurations and the profiles contain information specific to a particular client, the resources for that particular client are not to be downloaded or installed in a different client which meets the claim recitation of authorized resources. Therefore, using the term authorized resources would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to refer to specific resources are assigned to a specific client.

Hoggarth et al discloses receiving by a process (configuration agent) at the server a network address (identifier) associated with a computing system and computing system user (see column 7, lines 40-45). **Hoggarth et al** discloses the server process (configuration agent)

Art Unit: 2136

obtains client profiles and software profile that contain data that specify which resources are required for the computing system (see column 7, lines 24-30; column 7, lines 54-57; and column 9, lines 5-10) that meets the recitation of the configuration agent obtaining from the server data that specifies authorized resources corresponding to the received identifier.

Hoggarth et al further discloses the process server interrogating the computing system to produce an assessment indicating existing hardware and/or software computing system resources available on the computing system wherein software resources include one or more operating system, application(s), and personalized configuration setting information (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8). **Hoggarth et al** further discloses the server process identifying the authorized resources (software profile) with the assessment to identify one or more resources authorized but not installed on the computing system that meets the recitation of comparing the authorized resources with the assessment to identify one or more resources authorized but not installed on the computing system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15) wherein one or more resources authorized but not installed does not include updates of currently installed resources (see column 7, lines 30-31 and 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15 (other software)); and the server process automatically modifying the computing system resources by installing the one or more identified resources (see column 7, lines 48-57).

As per claim 2, **Hoggarth et al** discloses wherein one or more resources authorized but not installed includes updates of currently installed resources (see column 9, lines 5-33);

As per claim 3, **Hoggarth et al** discloses wherein the identifier associated with computing system and/or computing system user is received from the computing system (see column 9, lines 3-6).

As per claim 4, **Hoggarth et al** discloses wherein the identifier associated with computing system and/or computing system user is received from a communications device associated with the computing system user. **Hoggarth et al** discloses the client information retained at the server includes hardware identifiers, telephone number, and other personal information (see column 10, lines 9-27). **Hoggarth et al** does not explicitly disclose wherein the communications device is not directly connected to the computing system and wherein the communications device is one of the group consisting of a wireless telephony unit, a cellular telephone, a personal digital assistant, a personal computer, a KIOSK terminal, an automated teller machine, a wireline telephony unit, a facsimile machine, a video media player, an audio system and a software defined radio unit. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Hoggarth et al** to provide identifiers using a communications device which is not coupled to the communications device because since the server contains additional information of the computing system associated with the user, if the client cannot communicate to the server other means would be available to provide identifier associated with the computing system and/or computing system user as suggested by **Hoggarth et al** (see column 10, lines 9-27).

As per claim 5, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of automatically modifying the computing system resources of the communications device based at least in part of assessment of the computing system resources (see column 1, lines 33-44 and column 8, lines 5-20).

As per claim 6, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of selectively installing certain computing system resources based, at least in part, on the comparison of the assessed computing system resources against authorized and available computing system resources (see column 7, lines 19-30 and 48-57).

As per claim 7, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of assessing communications device resources (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8); comparing the assessed communications device resources against authorized and available communications device resources and selectively installing, configuring, and/or updating one or more communications device resources based, at least in part, on the comparison on the assessed communications resources (see column 7, lines 19-30 and 40-57).

As per claim 8, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the identifier is received from the computing system and/or a communications device associated with the computing system user remote from the computing system, the method further comprising:

automatically modifying communications device resources based at least in part of an assessment of the communications device resources (see column 4, lines 49-51 and column 7, lines 48-57). Claim 8 is also rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 4 above.

As per claims 9-10, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the identifier is one or more of a telephone number associated with the user an electronic serial number of the communications device associated with the user, an electronic identifier associated with the computing system and/or serial number associated with one or more hardware and/or software resources of the computing system (see column 9, line 50 through column 10, line 27).

As per claim 11, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the claimed method of claim 1 and further discloses a storage medium having stored thereon a plurality of executable instructions which when executed implement a method according to claim 1 (see column 4, lines 17-31). Claim 11 is therefore rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per claim 12, **Hoggarth et al** discloses a server comprising: a storage device having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions; and a control unit, coupled to the storage device to execute at least a subset of the plurality of executable instructions to implement a method according to claim 1 (see column 4, lines 17-31).

As per claim 13, **Hoggarth et al** discloses a server comprising: a storage device to maintain client profiles and software profile (see column 7, lines 54-57; column 8, lines 16-20 and lines 43-51; and column 9, lines 5-10) the client profiles and software profile contain data that specify which resources are required for the computing system. Although **Hoggarth et al** does not use the term "authorized" as interpreted by the Examiner, since the clients systems have

different configurations and the profiles contain information specific to a particular client, the resources for that particular client are not to be downloaded or installed in a different client which meets the claim recitation of authorized resources. Therefore, using the term authorized resources would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to refer to specific resources are assigned to a specific client.

Hoggarth et al discloses a process (configuration agent) coupled to the storage device (see column 4, lines 17-31) and receiving by a process (configuration agent) at the server a network address (identifier) associated with a computing system and computing system user (see column 7, lines 40-45). **Hoggarth et al** discloses the server process (configuration agent) generate an assessment of the current resources of the computing system (see column 7, lines 24-30; column 7, lines 54-57; and column 9, lines 5-10); (see also column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8). **Hoggarth et al** further discloses the server process identifying the authorized resources (software profile) with the assessment to identify one or more resources authorized but not installed on the computing system that meets the recitation of identify by comparing the assessment with the authorized resources one or more of the authorized resources which are missing from the computer system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15) wherein one or more missing authorized resources does not include updates of currently installed resources (see column 7, lines 30-31 and 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15 (other software)); and the server process automatically configure resources of the computing system to include the identified resources (see column 7, lines 48-57).

As per claim 14, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein an assessment of the computing system resources comprises an assessment of at least one of an operating system, configuration settings, personalization settings, Internet settings or application settings on the computing system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8).

As per claim 15, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the profile includes a list of identifiers associated with authorized users and the configuration agent accesses a user profile on the storage device based, at least in part, on the identifier (see column 8, lines 5-20 and 43-51).

As per claim 16, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration agent receives the identifier from the computing system and/or a communications device remote from the computing system associated with the computing system user (see column 9, lines 3-6).

As per claim 17, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration agent further automatically modifies communications device resources based at least in part of assessment of the computing system resources (see column 7, lines 48-57).

As per claim 18, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration agent is further configured to update the computing system resources (see column 9, lines 5-33).

As per claim 19, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the identifier is one or more of a telephone number associated with the user an electronic serial number of the communications device associated with the user, an electronic identifier associated with the computing system and/or serial number associated with one or more hardware and/or software resources of the computing system (see column 9, line 50 through column 10, line 27).

As per claim 20, **Hoggarth et al** discloses a server comprising: a storage device having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions; and a control unit, coupled to the storage device to execute at least a subset of the plurality of executable instructions to implement an instance of the configuration agent (see column 4, lines 17-31).

As per claim 21, **Hoggarth et al** discloses a storage medium comprising a plurality of executable instructions including at least a subset of which that when executed implement a configuration agent at a server to maintain, on a server for each of a plurality of computing systems, client profiles and software profile (see column 7, lines 54-57; column 8, lines 16-20 and lines 43-51; and column 9, lines 5-10) the client profiles and software profile contain data that specify which resources are required for the computing system. Although **Hoggarth et al** does not use the term "authorized" as interpreted by the Examiner, since the clients systems have different configurations and the profiles contain information specific to a particular client, the resources for that particular client are not to be downloaded or installed in a different client which meets the claim recitation of authorized resources. Therefore, using the term authorized

resources would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to refer to specific resources are assigned to a specific client.

Hoggarth et al discloses implement a process (configuration agent) at the server to conduct an assessment of the computing system resources upon receipt of an identifier associated with a computing system and/or computing system user a network address (identifier) associated with a computing system and computing system user (see column 7, lines 40-45; column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8). **Hoggarth et al** further discloses the server process identifying the authorized resources (software profile) with the assessment to identify one or more resources authorized but not installed on the computing system that meets the recitation of identify by comparing the assessment with the authorized resources one or more of the authorized resources which are missing from the computer system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15) wherein one or more missing authorized resources does not include updates of currently installed resources (see column 7, lines 30-31 and 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15 (other software)); and the server process automatically configure resources of the computing system to include the identified resources (see column 7, lines 48-57).

As per claim 22, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration agent is further configured to update computing system resources (see column 9, lines 5-33).

As per claim 23, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration agent interrogates the computing system upon receipt of an identifier to assess computing system

Art Unit: 2136

resources (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8).

As per claim 24, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration agent modifies the computing system resources to include available and authorized resources based at least in part of the assessment (see column 7, lines 48-57).

As per claim 25, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the computing system is a communications device (see column 4, lines 1-16).

As per claim 26, **Hoggarth et al** discloses wherein the identifier is received from a communications device remote from the computing system and wherein the configuration agent automatically modifies computing system resources and communications device resources based at least in part on assessment of system resources of the computing system and communications device resources (see column 4, lines 49-51 and column 7, lines 48-57). Claim 26 is also rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 4 above.

As per claim 27, **Hoggarth et al** substantially discloses a new unconfigured computing system comprising a storage device having stored thereon a plurality of executable instructions (see column 4, lines 1-16 and column 7, lines 30-36); a network interface communicatively coupling to the computing system to a network (see column 7, lines 30-36) and system BIOS that meets the recitation of a controller coupled to the storage device and the network interface to

Art Unit: 2136

execute at least a subset of the plurality of executable instructions to implement a basic input/output system to issue a configuration request to the network via the network interface, (see column 7, lines 30-42), the configuration request including an identifier associated with computing system (see column 7, lines 38-46), wherein the configuration request is configured to cause a recipient of the request to access client profiles and software profile (see column 7, lines 54-57; column 8, lines 16-20 and lines 43-51; and column 9, lines 5-10) the client profiles and software profile contain data that specify which resources associated by the identifier are required for the computing system. Although **Hoggarth et al** does not use the term "authorized" as interpreted by the Examiner, since the clients systems have different configurations and the profiles contain information specific to a particular client, the resources for that particular client are not to be downloaded or installed in a different client which meets the claim recitation of authorized resources. Therefore, using the term authorized resources would have been an obvious modification to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made so as to refer to specific resources are assigned to a specific client. **Hoggarth et al** further discloses provide the missing authorized resources to the computing system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57).

As per claims 28 and 31, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the plurality of executable instructions make an assessment of current hardware and/or software resources of the computing system, wherein the configuration request is based at least in part on the assessment, (see column 7, lines 40-45; column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8) and wherein the recipient of the request compares the assessment to

Art Unit: 2136

the authorized resources to determine one or more of the authorized resources missing from the computing system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15) and wherein the computing system is a communications device (see column 4, lines 1-16).

As per claims 29-30, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the controller receives one or more commands to receive and install computing system resources from network devices remote from the computing system via the network interface in response to the configuration request (see column 7, lines 53-58); wherein the identifier is associated with the computing system and/or computing system user (see column 7, lines 37-45).

As per claim 32, **Hoggarth et al** substantially discloses a method comprising issuing a configuration request from a new unconfigured computing system wherein the configuration request includes an identifier associated with computing system and/or computing system user (see column 7, lines 38-46), and is configured to cause a recipient of the request to generate an assessment of the current resources of the computing system (see column 7, lines 40-45; column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, line 57 through column 10, line 8);

Hoggarth et al discloses accessing client profiles and software profile (see column 7, lines 54-57; column 8, lines 16-20 and lines 43-51; and column 9, lines 5-10) the client profiles and software profile contain data that specify which resources associated by the identifier are required for the computing system. Although **Hoggarth et al** does not use the term "authorized" as interpreted by the Examiner, since the clients systems have different configurations and the profiles contain information specific to a particular client, the resources for that particular client

Art Unit: 2136

are not to be downloaded or installed in a different client which meets the claim recitation of authorized resources. **Hoggarth et al** further discloses the server process identifying the authorized resources (software profile) with the assessment to identify one or more authorized resources not installed on the computing system that meets the recitation of comparing the assessment to the authorized resources, to determine one or more of the authorized resources missing from the computer system (see column 7, lines 19-30, lines 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15) wherein one or more missing authorized resources does not include updates of currently installed resources (see column 7, lines 30-31 and 48-57, and column 9, lines 10-15 (other software)); and receiving a response to the configuration request at the computing system, the response including the one or more computing system resources missing from the computing system, wherein the one or more computing system resources are automatically installed and configured on the computing system (see column 7, lines 48-61).

As per claim 33, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the one or more computing system resources are automatically installed and configured in response to installation and configuration commands received from a remote computing system (see column 7, lines 48-61).

As per claims 34-35, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the computing system is a communications device and wherein the one or more system resources enable the communications device to communicate over an additional communications medium (see column 4, lines 1-16 and column 9, lines 5-45).

As per claim 36, **Hoggarth et al** discloses the limitation of wherein the configuration request is issued from a communications device remote from the computing system associated with the computing system user, and wherein the communications device is one of the group consisting of a wireless telephony unit, a cellular telephone, a personal digital assistant, a personal computer, a KIOSK terminal, an automated teller machine, a wireline telephony unit, a facsimile machine, a video media player, an audio system and a software defined radio unit (see column 4, lines 49-51) the method further comprising: receiving a response to the configuration request at the communications device including one or more computing system resources, wherein the one or more computing system resources are automatically installed and configured on the computing system (see column 7, lines 48-57). Claim 36 is also rejected on the same rationale as the rejection of claim 4 above.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CARL COLIN whose telephone number is (571)272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

Art Unit: 2136

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Carl Colin/

Examiner, Art Unit 2136

March 31, 2008

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136